

By



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/051,226	01/22/2002	Won-Kyu Lee	6192.0278.AA	7988

7590

07/26/2005

McGuireWoods
Suite 1800
1750 Tysons Boulevard
Tysons Corner
McLean, VA 22102-4215

EXAMINER

SHENG, TOM V

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2677

DATE MAILED: 07/26/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/051,226

Applicant(s)

LEE ET AL.

Examiner

Tom V. Sheng

Art Unit

2673

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 April 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 6-11 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 12-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 4,5,15 and 16 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-3 and 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Song et al. (US Patent 6,313,889 B1).

The applied reference has a common assignee with the instant application.

Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) might be overcome either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not the invention "by another," or by an appropriate showing under 37 CFR 1.131.

As for claim 1, Song teaches a thin film transistor liquid crystal display (figure 18) of a line inversion type for block-driving data lines, comprising:

a data line comprising an extension part overlapping a portion of a pixel electrode (a connect portion 21 as a branch of a data line D extends to and being overlapped with a pixel electrode 10; column 15, lines 36-50) to substantially minimize a block defect

Art Unit: 2673

(figure 19C, a disconnection at point a is repaired by routing through another path by shorting and cutting at other places with a specific short at point c between the pixel electrode and the connection portion; column 17, lines 40 to column 18, line 12),

wherein the pixel electrode is arranged at a boundary pixel (Song inherently teaches this structure on every pixel that corresponds to the case of one data line per driving-block).

As for claim 2, Song's pixels read on claimed boundary pixels between an $(IN)^{th}$ data line and an $(IN+1)^{th}$ data line in the case where N is 1.

As for claim 3, the connect portion 21 is a width extending toward the pixel electrode from the data line D.

As for claim 12, Song's branch of data line D over pixel electrode reads on claimed, "at least one data line arranged over a pixel electrode of a boundary pixel".

As for claim 13, it is inherent that the pixel electrodes be made of a transparent conductive material for a transmissive display.

As for claim 14, it is inherent that the pixel electrodes be made of a reflective conductive material for a reflective display.

Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claims 6-11 are allowed.

4. Claims 4, 5, 15 and 16 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Art Unit: 2673

5. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: none of the prior arts teaches the limitations "wherein the extension part is composed of extension pieces protruding from the data line to each pixel electrode of the boundary pixels" of claim 4, "wherein an area of the extension part is substantially equal to an area of a pixel electrode that overlaps a data line arranged over a portion of the pixel electrode" of claim 5, "the pixel electrode having an area overlapping an adjacent data line passing around the respective pixels, wherein the TFT-LCD further comprises at least one of the plurality of data lines having an extension part overlapping at least one of the plurality of pixel electrodes of a boundary pixel" of claim 6, "wherein at least one data line comprises a first extension part arranged substantially across the boundary pixel electrode and a second extension part that extends from an end of the first extension part" of claim 15, and "wherein an area of overlap between the pixel electrode of the boundary pixel and the data line arranged over the pixel electrode of the boundary pixel is larger than an area of overlap between a second pixel electrode of a second pixel and a second data line arranged over the second pixel electrode" of claim 16. Claims 7-11 are dependent on claim 6.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed on 4/22/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

As for claims 1-3, applicants argue that Song does not teach the minimization of a block defect. The examiner disagrees. In view of a lack of limitation regarding block

Art Unit: 2673

defect in the claim, the examiner interprets block defect as any kind of defect on any data line, and the disconnection at point a is appropriately regarded as a block defect. Moreover, since the connect portion is over the pixel electrode, it overlaps the pixel electrode. Claim 2 further defines the boundary pixel in relation to the block, but Song still anticipates it in the case of N equals 1. Block driving usually involves driving many lines per block.

As for claims 12-14, applicants argue that Song does not teach that the connect portion overlaps sufficiently to substantially minimize a block defect. The examiner disagrees. First, Song teaches using fixing a block defect by rerouting the data path using the connect portion. Second, claim 12 does not further define the claim on "overlaps sufficiently to substantially minimize a block defect", as argued.

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 2673

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tom V. Sheng whose telephone number is (571) 272-7684. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00am - 6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bipin Shalwala can be reached on (571) 272-7681. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Tom Sheng
July 21, 2005

Lun-Yi Lao
Primary Examiner

